

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-14 are active in this case, Claim 9 having been amended by the present amendment. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action Claims 7-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite; Claims 8 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being dependent on a rejected base claim; Claims 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,339,092, hereinafter Johnson); Claims 7 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson as applied to Claim 5, and further in view of Tanaka (U.S. Pat. 5,824,935); Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson and Tanaka as applied to Claims 5 or 7, and further in view of Spaulding et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,091,849, hereinafter Spaulding); and Claims 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson as applied to Claim 5, and further in view of Auger et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,130,678, hereinafter Auger) and further in view of Perbet et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,150,105, hereinafter Perbet).

In reply to paragraph 2 of the outstanding Office Action, a substitute specification is being filed herewith. Only the formatting has been changed. No new matter has been added.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

The stroke element recited in Claim 7 is described in the specification at least at page 9, line 16 to page 10, line 10. Stroke elements are the actor elements of the image, and the scenery elements of the image are the background elements.<sup>1</sup> A stroke element is an active


---

<sup>1</sup> Applicants' Specification, page 9, line 23 to page 10, line 3.

element as opposed to a stationary background element. In an exemplary embodiment of the claimed invention, stroke elements are smoothed, whereas the background elements are not. In Johnson, an aliased, jagged line is contrasted with a widely accepted smooth high quality stroke.<sup>2</sup> The stroke element recited in Claim 7 is definite and widely known in the art. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, that rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 9 has been amended to clarify the claimed invention. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the present amendment and in light of the above comments Claim 7, and Claims 8-12 which depend from Claim 7 are believed to be allowable, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Turning now to the rejection of Claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Claim 5  recites a system for displaying an image on a screen, including a symbol generator connected to an image memory, a correlator connected to the memory and comprising "a luminance ✕ path which performs a synchronous processing in parallel of the luminous levels of the n pixels or subpixels by selecting a microregion."

As noted in the outstanding Office Action, Johnson does not disclose a correlator.<sup>3</sup> Johnson describes a beam former.<sup>4</sup> The beam former of Johnson acts as a matching filter between the graphic generator and the display device.<sup>5</sup> Johnson does not disclose or suggest synchronous processing in parallel performed in the beam former.

Therefore, Johnson does not disclose or suggest a system for displaying an image on a screen as in Claim 5. In light of the above comments, Claim 5, and Claims 6-14 which

---

<sup>2</sup> Johnson, column 1, lines 21-33.

<sup>3</sup> Office Action mailed December 5, 2003, page 4, lines 7-8.

<sup>4</sup> Johnson, column 3, lines 18-37; column 12, line 44 to column 13, line 16.

<sup>5</sup> Johnson, column 3, lines 18-21.

depend from Claim 5 are believed to be clearly patentably distinguishing over Johnson. It is respectfully requested that this rejection of Claims 5 and 6 be withdrawn.

The remaining references of record have been considered, but do not cure the deficiencies of Johnson, as above discussed. Therefore, the pending Claims 5-14 are believed to be allowable.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above comments, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in this application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)

Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Registration No. 28,870